

**London Assembly (Extraordinary Plenary) Meeting – 17 December 2014
Transcript of Agenda Item 3: Question and Answer Session – Proposal to Designate a
Mayoral Development Area**

Roger Evans AM (Chairman): Can I welcome Sir Edward Lister, Chief of Staff, and Victoria Hills, Director of the proposed MDC.

Before we go into questions, I would like to invite Sir Edward to make a short presentation to us. I understand you have some slides, which will be very helpful.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Yes, I do Chairman, however I was not particularly going to use them as part of the presentation. They were there just in case we needed them in the course of the questioning. The slides we have are of the Park Royal/Old Oak Common area. We also have a slide of the public land and one or two others, if that is where people want to take some of the questioning. However I think these are documents that have been seen by most people at one time or another.

Could I just say just a few words. This whole project has been very much driven by the imminent arrival of High Speed 2 (HS2) and Crossrail to the Old Oak Common area. Once that arrives in 2026 we have a very, very exciting area, which has in its totality about 950 hectares right across the whole area. However the core of it, the 105 hectares of land around Old Oak Common itself, is the area that we are primarily interested in and is the area that has the greatest opportunity for development. Of that, there is about 80 hectares of developable land; the difference being canals, railway lines, and other things.

That will produce, by our estimates, 24,000 homes and 55,000 jobs. The 55,000 jobs will come as a result of constructing about 750,000 [square] metres of commercial floor space. That commercial floor space will predominantly be around the two stations: the Crossrail and the HS2 station. We do see that as being a great location for commercial development going forward into the latter part of the 2020s because, by then, much of the known commercial floor space in London will have been built out. We will be ready for another new area to come on-stream with that amount of commercial floor space, and of course it is uniquely situated; no more than about 15 minutes from the city and about 15 minutes from Heathrow. This is going to be pretty unique, therefore it is going to be a great place for commercial offices, for hotels, and for other uses.

The opportunity is truly vast and is truly exciting and the stakes are really, really high. That is why the Mayor feels strongly that we must not delay and we have to push on and get a MDC in place and start the preparation and development of this area, and, above all, to start looking at the wider infrastructure. There was a question from the Assembly about the sort of infrastructure costs, which we have provided some information on. Our best estimate, is that about £1.5 billion of infrastructure costs are needed to make this area work. Much of this comes as a result of the lack of permeability in the area at the moment and also because much

of the existing infrastructure is not fit for purpose going forward. Therefore it really is very much a clean slate that we have to start with and we have to completely rebuild everything.

It is an area with several jewels in its crown. It has a superb piece of canal riverside going through it; it has the Park Royal industrial area, which is probably the most important industrial area in London and something the Mayor is totally committed to protecting. However, it also has the stations and of course, where they are going, about 50% of the core area is owned by Government, in one form or another: it is all public land down there, and I think that is a very, very important factor.

We have wanted to build on the developments in east London with the MDC there at the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), and this whole model, which is before you today, is very much built upon that. We have tried to learn the lessons from that in bringing this forward.

To achieve the sort of transformation, which we are putting forward, is going to take leadership: leadership that will need to secure the levels of investment that are going to be needed to make this area work; to tackle the commercial negotiations - and there are going to be many of those - and above all to get all the players involved to bring forward their land for development. I do not think it escapes anybody's notice that the owners of public land have not always been the first people to bring their land forward for development. Therefore it is very important that they are part of this and an integral part of it.

The proposal for the MDC is that we work with our key partners, we work with the boroughs, we work with the transport authorities and we work with the local business community and the residents, and above all the people in Park Royal itself. It is about raising the sort of cash that we need for this project. Therefore I would put it to you that this is a great opportunity: it is the next extension of Mayoral development powers; it is a plan that is going to last for 20 years; it is a plan that is going to have five different Mayors in this building; it will have five different borough authorities in the three boroughs. I am sure we will have all shapes of political colour - and probably some we have never even thought of - before it is all finished. It is that kind of long-term vision.

However it is that kind of long-term vision that the Mayor of London's position was established for. That is why I would humbly suggest the Greater London Authority (GLA) is here, why the Assembly are here, why the Mayor is here: it is to provide that kind of leadership. Therefore I really have great pleasure in laying this before you for your consideration today. Thank you, Chairman.

Roger Evans AM (Chairman): Thank you. Now, the way we are going to do this, rather than tabling a lot of questions, we have just one question tabled in my name, and then we will take supplementaries from the rest of the Groups. The question that I have tabled is suitably wide to allow the debate to range across really the whole gamut of issues. The question that I am putting is: could you set out the likely benefits for London and the possible risks of the proposed MDC for Old Oak and Park Royal? Now, I accept you may well have dealt with quite a

lot of that in your opening statement, however if you wish to add anything this is a good opportunity to do it.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Thank you, Chairman. The thing that I did not say at the beginning, and perhaps I should have done, is our best estimates at the moment of the value to the United Kingdom (UK) economy of this MDC. We have calculated that value - taking into account business rates, income tax, stamp duty, all the other things - at about £15.5 billion¹. So it is pretty significant as an area and it is going to be a very important piece.

Secondly, I would say that we have done this very much in conjunction with the HS2 task force. We have been meeting with them, we have been meeting with Treasury officials. There has been an awful lot going on on that side of things, because, if the country is spending £50 billion-plus on building the HS2 railway network, they quite rightly want to make sure that the economic benefits of that flow through to the local economy. So this is a core piece of that, and indeed those discussions with the HS2 task force have been about some of the funding that we may need in the future, some of the planning that we will need to do. So we have done this, we are not in isolation and we are working with them as we bring these proposals forward.

I would also say that we have been in discussion with the local authorities over some considerable time, both the current administrations and the previous administrations. Indeed, it was about two years ago that we published our draft plans for Old Oak, so those have been in circulation for quite a long time and indeed people in this room have commented on them at various stages in that process.

I do not think there was anything else that I wanted to add.

Roger Evans AM (Chairman): Thank you. In that case we will move on to supplementaries and I invite colleagues to indicate.

Kit Malthouse AM: I just wanted to raise the issue of Wormwood Scrubs with you. You helpfully wrote to me yesterday - following quite a lot of emails from alarmed residents of that area who have an interest in the Scrubs - outlining the Mayor's commitment to protecting it. However, could you just explain to us, if there are no designs on the Scrubs as such, why does it need to be included in the boundary of the MDC?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Wormwood Scrubs is protected through its own Act of Parliament from 1879, so it already has built into it very strong protection, and nothing, absolutely nothing, can be done down there without the agreement of the Trustees of Wormwood Scrubs.

The reason we consider it important to have Wormwood Scrubs within the MDC's boundary is because we need to ensure there is permeability from the north to the south. Firstly, if we are putting 24,000 homes to the north of Wormwood Scrubs, it is obviously important that those

¹ Clarification was provided following the meeting that the £15.5 billion would be over a 30 year period

residents have the opportunity of going on to the Scrubs, and likewise those residents to the south in Hammersmith and Fulham and Acton will want to go across the Scrubs to get into the Old Oak Common area. Therefore it is quite important. However we have no proposals for any roads. All we are talking about is breaking through the railway at various points to provide access. We will obviously only do that in conjunction and discussion with the Wormwood Scrubs Charitable Trust. We have no designs to do anything, to build anything, to do anything other than create those access ways, and I hope the note that the Mayor wrote to you gives you the sort of reassurances you are looking for.

Kit Malthouse AM: Yes, the note was helpful. My reading of the note, and what you have said this morning, is essentially that the Trustees would have a veto on anything that might be proposed for the Scrubs. Is that the case?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): As far as opening up under the railway, I would have thought that would be down to us, because we are, with the transport authorities, the access way. However, anything on the Scrubs itself: yes, they have a veto on that. It is very clear in the Act what their powers are. It is an extremely strong Act of Parliament that protects them. I have it here. Therefore I think that their protection is pretty unique.

Kit Malthouse AM: The final thing from me was just about the routes of HS2. I think there are three routes, one of which may impinge on the Scrubs, the southern route. Is that route now off the table?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): No, I think what you are referring to is the Overground. Yes, there are three proposals that are on the table for dealing with the Overground. Just for everybody's benefit: there are two Overground lines that go through Old Oak and they are not connected together, they are separate. There have been - and there is - a consultation that Transport for London (TfL) has undertaken to look at the options and there are three options.

Option A is the building of a brand new Overground station, which would require a viaduct to be built on part of the Scrubs. I would tell everybody that that is the most expensive option of all.

There is a second option, which involves trains reversing into a new station and the drivers getting out and going around the other end of the train and driving back out again, which is called option B. Quite frankly I do not think anybody likes that one.

Then there is option C, which is certainly my favourite; I think I am fair in saying it is the Mayor's favourite. He has not yet made a formal decision on this and it is something that has yet to happen, however there is option C, which is the building of two stations, not one, one on each line: one slightly to the west of the new HS2 station and one slightly to the north. That is the favoured route; it is the cheapest, which has a lot of benefits. However, it also has the most economic value because it does mean that people are moving between those stations, it does

create some movement, some activity, and some economic generation and place-making that can go around that. That is where we are.

The Friends of Wormwood Scrubs have made it absolutely clear that they dislike intensely option A and I think quite frankly so do most people.

Kit Malthouse AM: Just on that, on option A: if what you said before is right about the Act of Parliament and the Trustees, presumably TfL could not proceed with option A without the consent of the Trustees?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): No, I think they would have to get the consent or they would have to go through quite a lengthy legal process --

Kit Malthouse AM: They would have to get an amendment to the Act of Parliament.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): -- which I think is probably enough to kill it on its own. However, I do stress, I think the preference of everybody is this option C, both on financial grounds and quite frankly on economic regeneration, and simply because it is the easiest. Why make life, which is already complicated, more complicated?

Kit Malthouse AM: The final thing from me, just on the Scrubs: is it likely, do you think, that the Scrubs could be a recipient of Section 106 money arising from the development for the improvement of its facilities?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Absolutely, however that would be up to the [Wormwood Scrubs] Charitable Trust, if they want it, and there are probably arguments why they may want that, because there may be improvements. When I say "improvements" I am talking about drainage or something like that. I am not talking about building on anything. I am just talking about maintenance and management issues, and, yes, they would be quite in their rights to bring forward, as they are part of the MDC area, their proposals for that expenditure, which would have to come out of the funding, which the MDC will have access to.

Kit Malthouse AM: OK, thank you.

Navin Shah AM: Chair, the same issue: Wormwood Scrubs. The campaigners and Wormwood Scrubs Charitable Trust are aware of explanation given by the Mayor and the negotiations you had. We have a letter, the Assembly Members have a letter from yesterday from the Trust, who maintain that they still have grave concerns about the inclusion of the Scrubs in MDC area. Is the message now therefore from you that you are not prepared to budge to the campaigners?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I would say to you that to change the proposed boundaries of the MDC would require quite a lot of further consultation, which will create an enormous amount of delay. Secondly, if Wormwood Scrubs is

not part of the MDC then they are not going to be in receipt of any of the benefits that come from it. Thirdly, I do think it is absolutely vital, and indeed it is in the Act, that we get this permeability on to Wormwood Scrubs. It makes it quite clear:

“Upon trust for the perpetual use thereof by the inhabitants of the Metropolis for exercise and recreation.”

It is about getting access. You cannot get on to the Scrubs today from the north, it is not possible. I think it is a really important piece of improvement to London to have that accessibility.

Navin Shah AM: Can I ask you whether you are able to guarantee that the Wormwood Scrubs Act 1879 will not be repealed and will continue in perpetuity?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I think that is probably more a question for lawyers than for me. As far as I understand it, unless there is an Act of Parliament to repeal it, it is not possible to repeal it. Nobody has made any proposals to do anything like that. Certainly the Mayor has no desire to do it. I cannot see a future Mayor wanting to do it. We are all totally convinced, I have met the Friends and I have walked over Wormwood Scrubs with them. I have seen the area. It is a great piece of London, it is a wonderful piece of London and it is a great, great asset, which we all fully support. I am absolutely convinced nobody would dream of doing anything detrimental to that piece of land. Can I just underline: when we talk about access we are talking about foot access, not vehicle access. It is foot access that we are talking about: it is the ability for people to walk across it from the north to the south, which means we must have the ability to make those access ways.

Navin Shah AM: Well, that is an interesting comment, because the letter I have also mentions the conversation they had about MDC confirming that there would not be any development of roads and buildings on the Scrubs. However, the possibility of access across the Scrubs and a tunnel to the station possibly in the future has not been ruled out. Obviously the Trust and campaigners are very concerned about it and therefore they do not want the boundary to incorporate the Scrubs land.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Firstly, the station is not going to be built [open] until 2026 so there --

Navin Shah AM: There is a possibility.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): -- is quite a long way. We have no clear idea at the moment whether it is a tunnel or it is a bridge. However, certainly we need to create accessibility from the station, and indeed from other sites to the east and to the west of the station, across the railway line. The big problem about the whole Old Oak Common area is the permeability of it. I know many Members from this room have been around Old Oak and have seen it themselves. You cannot go north/south, east/west easily, it is really hard to do it. Therefore, I think everybody would support the need for this permeability. However how we are going to do it is not something we have thought through.

Navin Shah AM: If I can move on to a question about the governance structure, which has been common theme for the three boroughs who are obviously involved and part of the whole project and partnership, as you said. Can you explain to me why have you rejected calls from the three boroughs to have two members per borough on the board, and the same for the planning committee composition, when the Mayor will still have ability to retain the casting vote? This is something they have explicitly asked for. Can you explain the reason?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I think I will be honest with this; we are not creating a local authority committee here. We are creating a board, a management board, a board that is meeting in exactly the same way the LLDC meets today. It meets to do the planning and to take the necessary actions to develop out the area over a 20-year timeline, even perhaps longer. What we wanted to make sure was that it was a manageable board; not too many people. We needed to have the railway authorities; HS2, Crossrail, TfL, Network Rail, need to be members of the board. If they are not integral to the board, and, excuse me for saying so, their hands have to be clearly dipped in the blood of trying to make this whole scheme work and they are part of it, they are not remote bodies., So they need to be part of it otherwise we will just not get this to work. We needed to have a local representative, we needed to have local business, and that is basically how the board has been put together. However, it is a board, it is trying to keep the numbers down.

Navin Shah AM: However, by keeping the numbers down, are you not depriving the boroughs of further influence that they should be able to exercise for what happens within their own patch, albeit at a strategic level?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I would argue that they are able to do that. We are proposing, as part of the structure of the MDC, that they will be statutory consultees as we go through this and make sure they are consulted on the various plans. That consultation arrangement is in place. They are part of the main decision-making body, which will decide the future of the place. I keep being asked, "What if there is a vote?" There has never been a vote on the LLDC to the best of my knowledge; it does not happen. It is about a delivery body that is making something work and it is a management board and I think that is the great difference. What we have here is a group of people who have very strong vested interests in making this place work. The boroughs have a strong interest, the rail authorities have a very strong interest. That is the composition of the MDC; that is the composition of the MDC at the Olympic Park, and I would suggest to you going forward into the future - and I am sure there are going to be other MDCs because future Mayors are going to bring forward MDCs as well - that will probably be the sort of composition going forward.

Navin Shah AM: Would the boroughs, their elected representatives, be involved in the appointments panel for the advertised posts? Yes or no will do.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): We have not even sat down and thought that through. I certainly see no reason why they should not be a part of that. Do not forget, they will have much better knowledge about the local residents than we will have. However, bodies like HS2 and TfL: I do not think we are looking at an appointments

panel for them. They will nominate the person they think is appropriate from within their organisation to manage the relationship on their behalf.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you very much. Thank you, Chair.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Sir Edward, one of the things, which Ealing wanted, was that they wanted North Acton to be excluded from the MDC. They had an understanding - or they felt they had an understanding from you - that it would be excluded. Can you show us why it is that it has not been excluded and why they may have come to this understanding?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I am somewhat surprised by what you are saying. It was certainly never my understanding that they wanted to be excluded from the MDC and indeed --

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: North Acton --

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): No, North Acton has always been within the MDC boundary and the discussions have always been that they would be within the MDC boundary. That has never varied. Where there was a -- "disagreement" probably is the wrong word - but where there was a difference of view is that Ealing wanted to make sure all the planning powers in the North Acton area were delegated to them. That is something that we are quite happy about and there will be a need to have a scheme of delegation to them. So I do not think that is a dispute.

I think what they did want was complete control over any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies that came from the North Acton area. The thing is that under the Planning Act [2008] we are not able to give them that. If we are the plan-making authority, we must be the CIL-making authority, the two things go together. So we are not able to subscribe to that.

They also wanted us to guarantee that all the monies for the CIL in North Acton were spent in North Acton. I do not think we can make that guarantee. I think, over the course of the life of this there will be far more spent in North Acton than will ever be raised by the CIL, however whether the account at any point in time is in positive or negative I think will have to depend upon the circumstances of the day. The big money for CIL of course is coming out of Old Oak, not out of North Acton. There will be monies that will have to be spent by the Development Corporation all around the Old Oak area, indeed there could be monies that have to be spent outside the MDC simply to make it all work.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: The other thing the three boroughs are concerned about is the level of affordable housing. We know that funding of this MDC is uncertain. You have told us that £1.5 billion is required for infrastructure. The fear is that we will not get enough affordable housing here. Looking at the previous Mayoral Decisions, that goes against affordable housing, and I know that you were asked this question on *Politics Show London*. Can you give any guarantees to it, can you give us some reassurance, that this affordable housing will be at 50% of the development?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): The London Plan talks about 50%. No, I cannot guarantee it will be at 50% and it is not at 50% anywhere in London under any authority in London and never has been. Even in Ken Livingstone's [former Mayor of London] time, where he was very robust about this, he never ever achieved those kind of percentages.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: What sort of percentages do you intend to introduce then?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): What I said, and I said it on the *Politics Show [London]*, and I have said it at meetings with various meetings with various people, is that when we have done our planning on the infrastructure study we have always assumed numbers around the 30% to 35% mark when we have been doing some of the calculations. This will have to come out of the wash as we move forward. It is not possible to be specific about the numbers. What I can tell you, from other areas in London where we are building substantial numbers of homes, is that over the life of those development areas the percentages of affordable housing are constantly going up and they consistently go up as the areas get established.

However, the first call is of course that £1.5 billion because, unless we spend £1.5 billion down there, nobody builds anything. You do not build any housing because you cannot get anything down there until you have started putting some of this infrastructure in place. That is going to take a lot of money out of it and of course all of that will have to be picked up out of the development area: it will have to be picked up through CILs. We will have to probably devise other funding mechanisms, such as the one we have devised at Vauxhall Nine Elms with tax increment financing (TIF) accessing business rates, or some other mechanism. We will have to devise those mechanisms over the life of this MDC to raise the kinds of money that we need.

However, certainly, the Mayor is well aware of the need for affordable housing. He is also very concerned that the area produces housing that is affordable in market terms as well. It is not a high-priced area and that requires careful thought made on the sort of densities, on the sort of projects, on the sort of construction that takes place there.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: There is a lot of uncertainty in all you are saying. I am not even sure you talk for Londoners. I mean this is a huge amount of land coming from Hammersmith and Fulham and from Brent and from Ealing and there is no guarantee that you are building the housing for Londoners. I mean this is going to be another one of those schemes with high rises meant for foreign investors making money on their behalf in London. We want some guarantees that London houses will be for Londoners.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Firstly I must tell you that will be of course fleshed out as we develop the local plan over the next couple of years. However, also, the bulk of the housing, by the way, is in the Old Oak Common area. There is a little bit in Acton; however it is predominantly in Old Oak. There is virtually nothing in Park Royal, just to be absolutely clear. Our interest in Park Royal is protecting the commercial industrial base there, it is not about building housing in that area.

We believe that we will get significant amounts of Section 106 [monies] over those developments, over the life of this project, and indeed I thought this sort of question might arise and I did - mainly because of the *Politics Show [London]* on Sunday - start pulling the numbers of affordable housing units built in any borough. I must tell you that the Mayor's production of affordable housing is by and large greater than that of the previous Mayor's eight years, and that is largely because of 106s, and that the previous Mayor did have the benefit of a booming property market and of course we have only had a booming property market really in the last year/18 months now. I think it is unfair to say there has not been a real effort by this Mayoralty to build affordable housing and I see no reason why we should not achieve the sort of numbers that we are talking about.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: You say there is a lot of things will be sorted out in the flesh, right, and it will take a lot of time. Why are we rushing this through when all these things have not been sorted out? Why are we rushing through to establish the MDC? Why this timescale?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): We really are not rushing this. Everybody keeps saying we are rushing it. We published the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF), this is the early version of it, two years ago. It has been two years in the making. We will publish this in February next year and this is of course the base document, which will then feed into the local plan. The local plan we will start work on in about April, once the MDC is fully established. The local plan will take about 18 months to two years to produce. That is the sort of timeline. We are just, for example, doing some of the planning document for city fringe; that has taken about that timeline to do. We did one for Croydon; that took about that timeline. It has quite a long gestation period while we work that through. The local plan will have to go to an Examination in Public (EIP). It will not go to an EIP until the other side of the Mayoral elections, therefore if the next Mayor is unhappy about any part in this then he is going to obviously make changes to it at that point and probably do further consultation. It is not rushing it. I do not think a couple of years to do a local plan is rushing something.

Roger Evans AM (Chairman): Assembly Member Johnson.

Darren Johnson AM: I hear what you say about Wormwood Scrubs and the issue of permeability. I do not at all doubt the need to improve permeability. However, surely, this type of thing can be done through sensible negotiations between boroughs. You do not need to include it in the MDC to ensure pathways and gates to public open space, do you?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I would suggest, if I may, that it would look ridiculous if we were to go ahead building a £50 billion rail network coming through Old Oak Common, which is not accessible to the people of Hammersmith and Fulham or Acton and they cannot walk there if they want to. Yes, it is true to say that, in theory, all this will be done by negotiation and I sincerely hope it will, however I can see --

Darren Johnson AM: In the case of Wormwood Scrubs, surely it has to be done by sensible negotiation rather than heavy-handed direction.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Obviously we do everything by negotiation if we can, however if we cannot get it through by negotiation then we have to have the ability to get this accessibility through on to the Wormwood Scrubs. Wormwood Scrubs is not an area that is exclusively for one group of people: it is a piece a land for all Londoners. We have to make sure it has that accessibility. I do not think the Friends or the Trustees are opposed to this; I am sure they are not, and I am sure we will be able to negotiate it through. However, if Wormwood Scrubs is not part of the MDC, it cannot access any of the 106 monies or the CIL monies and it is certainly going to make getting this permeability and accessibility that much harder.

Darren Johnson AM: So you will not agree to remove Wormwood Scrubs from the MDC and look at other ways of ensuring permeability?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): No, I strongly feel that it would be a mistake to do that. It is an area that naturally fits together. On some of our master planning that we have done in other parts of London, we have regularly tried to build parks into those areas. For once we have access to green space without having to build parks; it is there. It is ridiculous not - if I may suggest - to include it in the overall plan.

Now, in due course, a future Mayor, if they so desire, can change the boundaries. However, they would have to go through a lengthy consultation process² if that is what they wish to do.

Darren Johnson AM: OK, thank you. Moving on to the issue of transparency - and this is something, when we had the original first Plenary session around the LLDC on the Olympic site, and I was raising issues about transparency there - one of the issues for local residents and businesses, the operation of the planning committee should not be any different to any local authority planning committee in terms of being able to speak at meetings, access to information, and so on. Will you give that assurance for this MDC?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): The structure of how people put the planning committee together over the course of time has not yet been discussed. Planning committees work in different ways across London. At some planning committees, people are allowed accessibility to speak; in others they only allow written representation. That discussion has not taken place. We would obviously take advice from the local community on the best way of moving that forward.

What I am more than happy to give you an absolute assurance about, and I think you know you can accept what I am saying here, is that the MDC will be a transparent organisation. Its documents will go on the website, and the only items that are in closed session are those that are commercial in nature and cannot be on the website. Indeed, there have been comments through one of the Committees here about another organisation within the Mayoral family, which has not been particularly transparent, and I think there has been a reassurance given to the Chairman of the Committee by the Mayor that transparency will be in place. The Mayor is absolutely clear about that.

² Clarification was provided following the meeting that a boundary change would also require a new designation order

Darren Johnson AM: I am reassured on those transparency commitments, which do echo similar assurances I sought ahead of the LLDC proposal. However, just in terms of public speaking rights at committee meetings, , looking at best practice around the boroughs, I think it would be a huge mistake not to take that opportunity. Therefore I would invite you now to give an assurance that you will look at allowing public speaking rights at planning committee meetings, as is best practice in many boroughs across London.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I am more than happy to give you the assurance that I will make sure that the Chairman of the MDC or the Mayor is well aware of that request and I am --

Darren Johnson AM: Would that be your preference?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I am quite happy to give you my personal assurance that I think they should have speaking rights. I have to say to you that, like all these things, it is about managing the process of those committees.

Darren Johnson AM: Boroughs have sensible rules on that, as does the Mayor of London here in terms of the planning decisions under his control. Thank you.

Roger Evans AM (Chairman): Assembly Member Knight.

Stephen Knight AM: Just one quick point and that is, is it legally possible to spend Section 106 or CIL money outside the boundary of a planning authority?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Yes it is, however it has to relate to the MDC's area, it has to be directly --

Stephen Knight AM: For instance, if it were the public open space that was serving the MDC's area then it would be possible to spend planning gained money that was gathered within the MDC area on an area of say public open space next to it?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Provided it related to the development that is taking place there.

Stephen Knight AM: I think that is helpful clarification. The main area I wanted to focus on is around affordable housing. We have touched on it already. I wonder if you can tell us, in your view, what are the main challenges to achieving a higher proportion of affordable housing on this site, given that the starting point is land that is industrial in nature and therefore its existing use value should be very low, or relatively low?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I think there are a number of things. Firstly, we do not know the state of that land; we do not know the levels of contamination, and I suspect there are quite high levels of contamination there. That is an unknown as of today.

The second one is the point I made about the £1.5 billion and that by the way is an early estimate, we are still doing the Development Infrastructure Funding (DIF) study at the moment and those numbers will move around, so I would not like anybody to hold us to that number. However I cannot believe for one minute it will be less than that. We will need to raise that and without that nothing is built.

I think the third one is about the timelines for bringing all of this forward. We are able to move on some parts of the site relatively quickly, mainly to the north and around the periphery of the site. The core site itself will not come forward until the mid-2020s and I think by then many things may be different.

Stephen Knight AM: Is the other major challenge not that existing landowners may seek to exact value out of their land over and above the existing use value as industrial land and that will eat into the available resource for affordable housing? Is that not the big challenge in this?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): May I make a request: can we put the land-ownership map up, because I think this will help.

Roger Evans AM (Chairman): We have it now.

Victoria Hills (Director, proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Redevelopment Corporation): What it shows is, of the core development site that Sir Ed alludes to, 50% of that core development site is in public sector ownership. Therefore it does present a real opportunity for us to work together with TfL and Network Rail, to try to get the best possible balance of housing and commercial development on that land. As you can see from the map, it is the site closest to the station, therefore, as Sir Ed alluded to at the start, it is a real jewel in the crown because, not only is it 50% of the core site, it is also the most valuable part of the core site, given its proximity to the station. Therefore there is a real opportunity to do something quite spectacular.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Can I just make one further point. One of the powers of the new MDC will be the ability to raise CILs and Section 106s in the meantime, and that has to be part of the mechanisms that we use to make sure that we do try to take some of that planning gain into it. However, one must be quite clear that the existing owners of that land have to raise sufficient money to make it worth their while relocating, moving, changing, whatever those existing owners may choose to do. They have a lot of costs. So it is not a cheap option, any of this; it is a very expensive process to bring that land forward. Even the railway land will require the relocation of depots, all of which the train-operating companies will be expecting to recover out of the development costs.

Stephen Knight AM: Indeed, and clearly there are two aspects of it, are there not. There are the private land owners who own some land to the north - Car Giant in particular - who may want to exact a profit out of it. There is also the issue about the public sector land, which is mostly in central Government hands, is there not, and while, as you say, they will need to exact presumably enough value out of that to pay for their relocation costs. Is there any indication

that they might be seeking to exact more value out of that land for the Exchequer rather than in terms of providing affordable housing locally? Is there not a potential conflict of interest of having those representatives on the board deciding the planning policies when in your own words they have a very strong vested interest in it as landowners?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): You could say the same for the Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, which is quite a big landowner as well, and you could suggest that they have a vested interest in the same way.

Stephen Knight AM: However they are not going to take money out, with respect, and spend it somewhere else in the country, are they, whereas the central government could. That is the real question.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Yes, of course they could, and I am sure that the rail authorities will be looking very hard at the sort of asset base they have here and what they want to do with it and what they want to extract from it. I am equally certain that HS2 will be looking very hard at this as well about what they want to extract from it because they have a big bill they have to fund. Therefore a lot of people are going to be looking at extracting value and --

Stephen Knight AM: Well that is exactly my concern: that a lot of people are going to want to extract value and that the loser will be affordable housing in all this. The question is, what can we do to make sure that does not happen?

Victoria Hills (Director, proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Redevelopment Corporation): What we have already done is set out the groundwork for a public sector landowners' forum. We have had our first meeting and it is really important, as you say, to ensure that all those public sector landowners join together in a shared vision. It is fair to say we are not all in the same place. I say 'we'; we do not own any land - however the public sector are not all in the same place. Some have had a think about what they might do with their land, others are not there yet, however what we are going to do is work with them to develop a strategy and a vision and some shared objectives. If we can do that, that puts us in a much better position than we currently are at the moment. So that --

Stephen Knight AM: Thank you. I am running out of time, I just want to put one last point, and that is, in the run-up to the Olympic Legacy Development Corporation, the Mayor was able to make a firm commitment that there would be, if you like, a floor to the amount of affordable housing, which was 35%, on the Olympic Park. Would such a minimum guarantee pledge from the Mayor in the case of this Development Corporation not act as a counterbalance from all the various landowners trying to extract value?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Yes, very quickly, I am well aware of those discussions on the LLDC and that could well be something that the Mayor will want to do here, however it is too early. Until we have completed the DIF study, until we have worked out what the total cost base is, it is not possible to make those kind of

assumptions. Obviously that is going to be something that is going to exercise the Mayor, it will exercise the Assembly, and indeed the MDC board.

Murad Qureshi AM: Can I raise two or three issues. The first one, Eddie, I am grateful that you mentioned the canals at the outset. It is just unfortunate they do not show up on the maps. I have no doubts that residential developers will be eying those canal sides very eagerly, because I suspect they can enhance the values of the developments by up to 40%. That is the residential side. However, I am more concerned that they are used during the works construction on the site. I think this is going to be a huge development site, over several decades. I know one nuisance that many local residents will not like at all is the huge movements of lorries, particularly for residents like Wells Road, who are, I think, unfortunately trapped. I just want to be reassured that the MDC, from the outset, will be making it clear that the canal will be used as a substantial means of moving materials and spoils out of this major site.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I am very happy to give you that reassurance and that can be part of the planning policy framework document that is put together. I would also just add that of course as part of HS2 and Crossrail there are some very large sites that have been earmarked as sites for disposal of the spoil, because a lot of the tunnelling is coming out here and will be disposed of on the railways network. I think we have to make sure we used that railway network as well for the commercial developments.

Murad Qureshi AM: I will endorse that, however I just hope the lessons from Crossrail in Paddington are learned; that is all I will say, and I am sure you can find out about it.

The second issue is Wormwood Scrubs and I concur with Councillor Wesley Harcourt [London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham] of College Park and Old Oak Common. However my concern is the accessibility of Wormwood Scrubs for the playing fields. Someone who grew up in W9, this is one of the places where we went to play football regularly, and the way into that site was always through the track and field, into Scrubs Park. From the boundaries, you have separated the two physically. Now I am just wondering how is that going to impact on the accessibility of those playing fields while they are in your hands?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I suspect there is a detail there, which I do not necessarily fully understand.

Victoria Hills (Director, proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Redevelopment Corporation): Could you bring this map up please?

Murad Qureshi AM: Yes, if you bring that up you can see the track and field is outside, it is a part of Wormwood Scrubs to all intents and purposes for anyone who uses the playing fields.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Certainly, I cannot imagine anybody in Hammersmith and Fulham, or indeed in Wormwood Scrubs, want to close off the existing access ways on to the Common.

Murad Qureshi AM: OK, can I be reassured that that is looked into?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Absolutely.

Murad Qureshi AM: Because the last time I used it, you used to go on to the track and field before you get in.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): We are about permeability here, totally about opening the -- there is a railway line down there of course.

Murad Qureshi AM: Sorry?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): There is the railway line down there, which creates, if it is where I think you are --

Murad Qureshi AM: Sure, there is also a car park there as well. That is the way most people normally come through.

The third issue, which is something I found out, it is coming into the business park area, and you are quite right: you want to maintain the commercial and business use there. However, there is a conflict of usage potentially, and interestingly enough the fracking company, London Local Energy, have suggested that one potential site it can sink a fracking well in is the Park Royal industrial estate near Willesden. Potentially that is the most centrally located fracking site. I just want to know where the MDC lies on this issue, given local boroughs like Brent have made quite clear what their position is.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): I have to say to you, I had not heard about that. I thought the only fracking sites were potentially in south London and not in north London, and that those firms have been looking to the south, however certainly not in that area. However there is no policy for the MDC, we have never even thought about it or considered it. What we are quite clear about is that it is important that there are some energy plants in that area to feed the area, however I am not talking about fracking when I am saying that, I am talking about certainly the green energies and the waste --

Murad Qureshi AM: Thank you. I will give you the reference, *BBC News Business*, 28 October 2014, and they quote a Nick Grealy [London Local Power] as saying that is one potential site. I say that because I should remind you that Councillor Muhammed Butt [Leader of Brent Council] has declared Brent to be a fracking-free zone, therefore it will be interesting to see how the planning committee deal with that one. I just raise that for information.

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Can we look into it? I cannot see us falling out with Muhammed Butt over this.

Murad Qureshi AM: I definitely hope so, because that is going to be dealt with in the planning committee.

Victoria Hills (Director, proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Redevelopment Corporation): It is fair to say there is a long list of infrastructure asks and there are a lot of things we have to pay for. We are looking at how it is funded and fracking is not part of that consideration at the current time. However we can certainly look into that.

Nicky Gavron AM: Eddie, I would like to ask some questions about some of the planning aspects of this, however first of all I want to ask you about the legislative process, which I am extremely ignorant on. An order has to be laid before Parliament? When does that have to happen and what is in it?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): The first stage is that the London Assembly needs to consider the matter and, provided they are not opposed to it, it then moves forward to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State then has to lay it before Parliament and there is a process that he has to then follow. Then he then needs to notify the Mayor about whether or not he approves the establishment of the MDC. If that approval can be obtained prior to purdah [the pre-election period] and that is obviously a consideration in all this, and then the MDC would come into operation on 1 April. It is on 1 April we would then move forward on developing the local plan.

Victoria Hills (Director, proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Redevelopment Corporation): I just wanted to add to it very briefly, the powers exist for the Mayor within the Localism Act, so in laying the designation in front of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of State is not required to approve. He is required to lay the orders before Parliament. Therefore it is a statutory process that follows after the Mayor writes to the Secretary of State.

Nicky Gavron AM: What is in the order?

Victoria Hills (Director, proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Redevelopment Corporation): There are two orders and it is nothing that you will not be familiar with already, because it is following exactly the same process as the LLDC. The first order is the designation order, which is essentially a single sheet of paper saying, "This is the Mayoral Development area", and the second order is the planning functions order and again it is very similar to the LLDC planning functions order in the sense of providing the [transfer of] planning powers to the MDC.

Nicky Gavron AM: Thanks for that, OK. Now, just to turn to the OAPF for a minute, you said it was well advanced. Can you tell us a bit about the sort of consultation you are doing? First of all, you know you showed us a document, you said it is well advanced or you said something similar, "Here it is", kind of thing. That has not been published, has it?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): Yes, it is published.

Victoria Hills (Director, proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Redevelopment Corporation): It was published in June 2013.

Nicky Gavron AM: That is what was published then, I see, OK. So what sort of consultations are you doing with the community?

Sir Edward Lister (Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning): That consultation took place then and that was the document that set out the 24,000 homes, the 55,000 jobs, all of that flowed from that document. The consultation with community will start when we start the work on 1 April of developing the local plan. That will have to go through a full consultation process with all the residents, with the boroughs, with all the statutory authorities, and will have to ultimately go before an EIP, and go through the whole EIP process, and then only at the end of that.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): It is fair to say that off the back of this work, a lot of work has been done and by the time the OAPF goes out to consultation, which will be around about February time, we envisage the OAPF being published in the summer of 2015. It is fair to say that by that point the OAPF will have been two years in the making.

Nicky Gavron AM: The OAPF is going out in February for consultation?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): That is right, yes.

Nicky Gavron AM: I understand you are setting up the consultation forum now, is that right?

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): The consultation has been running with the local community since the MDC consultation started in the summer, but in actual fact the work has been going on with the local community and the boroughs and all the stakeholders for a much longer period of time. This is bringing it all together in the OAPF that goes out for consultation.

Nicky Gavron AM: It goes out for consultation in February.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): Yes.

Nicky Gavron AM: OK, but it will not be completed until September?

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): It may be earlier, in the summer.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): August.

Nicky Gavron AM: In the middle of that in April you will have a --

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): We will start work on the Local Plan.

Nicky Gavron AM: You will have the MDC and you start work on the Local Plan.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes.

Nicky Gavron AM: You were saying earlier that you expect the Local Plan to be finished?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): About autumn 2016.

Nicky Gavron AM: The EIP will be after?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Would be probably in the summer of 2016.

Nicky Gavron AM: The whole of the Local Plan will still be in process in the early summer of 2016?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes. Correct.

Nicky Gavron AM: Right, OK.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Nothing will be settled in Local Plan terms this side of mayoral elections, if that is where the question is going.

Nicky Gavron AM: That is reassuring, I must say. That is different from what we were told by Victoria [Hills] .

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): I do accept that, although I caveated it at the time that I would come back to you with further detail, which I did.

Nicky Gavron AM: Can I just talk for a minute about what will be determined by the boroughs, and what will be determined by the MDC's planning committees?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): We have to have a scheme of delegation, which we have to negotiate with the boroughs. We have not done those negotiations yet, that is something that we have to do. The desire by us is that we try to hold all the strategic planning decisions to the MDC, but the local smaller schemes will be transferred to the borough and there will be a delegation which we will have to agree with the boroughs.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): Could we bring up map three actually? That would be helpful, because it just shows the point that you are making is that there will be a different level of delegation across the area and this map will hopefully show that for the three boroughs we will treat planning at a different level of delegation.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I do stress this all has to be negotiated - it has not been.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): It is well on the way and needs to be.

Nicky Gavron AM: It has got to be negotiated. You talked about the planning committee, and it does have strikingly strong powers, the planning committee. You are saying at the moment you do not know what the composition of it is going to be.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): That is the next piece of work that we have to work on. We have given an indication in one or two of the documents of the sort of composition. It is very much the same as the LLDC one. That has to be discussed and finalised with all the parties but we have not done that. At the moment we have been concentrating on getting the actual MDC board in position.

For the purposes of powers, it is to all intents and purposes a borough. It has the same powers as a borough planning committee.

Nicky Gavron AM: Thank you.

Tom Copley AM: I wanted to return to the issue of affordable housing, because given the shortage of homes that we have this is something that is of particular interest to Londoners. Onkar Sahota has already called for a 50% target. You said that no borough at any point, you thought, had he ever managed to reach 50%, but surely it is better to aim high and fall short of that rather than aiming for 30% or 35% and ending up with 20% or 25%?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I have to tell you that if we have achieved 30% or 35% we will have done better than any borough in London, so we are aiming pretty high. Yes, the London Plan talks about 50%. Yes, that is the target number. Yes, I fully accept that, but I must go back to the viability point. We have got some very big bills we have to pay and we have to extract £1.5 billion worth of infrastructure out of the area. Those bills have to be paid and that will affect the percentage of affordable housing. It is bound to affect it. Nevertheless, in our calculations we have gone for a figure very similar to the LLDC. If you do not mind me saying so, we have not had the kind of money that the LLDC has had from the central Government being pumped into it to buy the land. LLDC actually starts off in a very different place to us.

In Stratford we own the land and we are going for that. We do not own any land here. It is owned by others. What we have been trying to be is very realistic about what we are trying to achieve. I think it is a reasonable number to be putting in our calculation - at this stage. In due course this can be varied and will be varied as some of these numbers start to firm up, as the timelines for the infrastructure start to become clearer and, indeed, as possible other monies might become available to us both from HS2 and/or from the Treasury, and/or from the Housing Corporation or other places. That has not been factored in at all.

Tom Copley AM: Within this 30% - 35% can you give us any idea yet of what the breakdown within that would be of, for example, social housing or things like that? Of course 'affordable' now covers all manner of tenures.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): No, I'm afraid it is just a broad brush number. We have not done that kind of work and I do not think we can until we get further down the road with pulling together all the costs and the other issues that are out there. As I do say, it will change over the life of the project. In the early days we have to get some place making going, otherwise we will get nothing down here. Some of that is going to have to come off the bill.

Tom Copley AM: What about land values? Land values are obviously going to rise enormously during the planning and development process. Are there mechanisms that we could use to make sure that the rising land value is captured for the public good?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Only through the existing mechanisms which we have, which is CIL and Section 106 agreements. There are no other mechanisms out there that exist, so I am afraid no is the answer to the question.

Tom Copley AM: Is there anything that could be done in planning agreements or anything like that to try to extract more, for example for affordable housing, as the value of land and profitability rises?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Everybody realises the importance of getting affordable housing and, undoubtedly, we will do our best to get the numbers as high as we possibly can. Indeed, I think these are some of the discussions which the MDC has to have with Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and other places to try to extract monies from other places to help increase the affordable housing content. Indeed, one of the powers of the MDC will of course be land acquisition powers. It could well be that we start using some of our powers to acquire some of these sites ourselves to build affordable housing, and that is an option for the MDC.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you.

Jennette Arnold OBE (Deputy Chair): I have a couple of questions, one for Sir Eddie, and one for Victoria Hills.

Sir Eddie, in your introduction you mentioned that the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC) master plan was similar to the blueprint adopted by the LLDC. I know, as one of the three Assembly Members for the area covered by the LLDC, and was heavily involved in the consultation and now I keep a very strong watching brief on what is going on, that many aspects of the LLDC's vision has changed. For instance, the LLDC plan started off with proposals for 10,000 homes. I believe there is now an expectation that there will be 6,000-plus homes. There was a dramatic shift away from, I suppose, what people assumed would be a new suburban space, to now a new cultural and educational quarter. What learning have you or your team taken from that journey that the LLDC has been on, so that you can give us assurance today that the masterplan that we are talking about is as robust as possible, based on learning and that the OPDC of course may well have to go through changes but will not have to go through this major shift that took place with the LLDC?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): There are several points here. The first one is I am an observer on the LLDC Board, so I do attend the LLDC Board meetings, so I am very familiar with what has been taking place there over the years as the LLDC has evolved. Of course the LLDC has evolved over a period of time and I am equally sure the Old Oak MDC will evolve as well, and it will chop and change. Five mayoralities will mean it will change, that is inevitable. What we have tried to do is to make sure it is as flexible as possible, so that it can move and change as the need arises and the pressures come. I think the broad principles which we are running, which is a strong commercial core around stations, going into residential as you work away from that. I think is a principle that is unlikely to change over the life of this project, but I am sure there will be all sorts of things that will change. I am sure that different developers will come forward with their own ideas as to how they can achieve things. I am sure there will be opportunities, and indeed since we have been talking about the MDC we have had approaches. Just the fact that it is getting a higher profile, we are getting approaches coming from various organisations who are interested in establishing commercial presence down here. These are big employers, by the way. There is enormous potential which is going to come out of this and it will change, but I think the safeguards are there to make sure it is still to the benefit. I do not see us changing the 24,000 number.

Jenette Arnold OBE (Deputy Chair): Can I just ask a quick question, or make a comment to Victoria [Hills]. Under the GLA Act [GLA Act 1999] there is a requirement to ensure that you have regard to the principles of equality and they are embedded in anything that is done. You cannot answer it today, but I know that myself and Assembly Members Shawcross and Sahota would welcome some information about what sort of equality assessments have been done to ensure representation on boards, to ensure that the huge number and the very successful black and minority ethnic (BAME)-owned businesses are included. It is a piece of work that is as important as anything to be done, so I would welcome comments in writing, if you like, so that we can then explore it further. I know that the Labour Group is out of time, but this is as important a subject as anything else we have address today.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): May I give you that assurance now that I would not wish it to be any other way from that? You have that assurance and we will give you that in writing.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): I am delighted to do so.

Jenette Arnold OBE (Deputy Chair): Thank you, I will receive it in writing.

John Biggs AM: Unfortunately, most of my time has been taken by a Member making unscripted interventions, because we did plan our time for today. I will try to be very brief. I have two areas. One is about what we call 'cliff edges' and it relates to the experience of the LLDC, where the purpose of the Olympics and its legacy is to benefit a far wider area.

In answer to Stephen Knight [AM] who said that MDC money can be spent outside this area providing it meets its object, of course that begs the question of what the objects are. The

objects need to be set in a way that is wide enough for there to be similar sorts of arguments: such as about convergence, about economic regeneration of a wider area, about the ability to spend money to ensure that the benefits, if this thing goes ahead, are shared more broadly across the area, particularly the areas that need community regeneration or better employment outcomes. Are you clear about where your objectives get there?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Absolutely. We have tended to concentrate this session on the housing content, but I actually think the commercial content is as actually as important, if not more important. This is a new piece of commercial territory in London and we have to make sure that we learn from places like Canary Wharf that we do make sure we have the training schemes, the skill sets and everything else.

John Biggs AM: We have limited time. Are you clear in your objectives for this that it will have the *vires*, the legal powers to do such things?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Absolutely. We have the same planning powers as a local authority, we can do what a local authority has done and we can make sure there are conditions put into the planning process that ensures that opportunities are there for local people, that some of that money we take out goes into the skills agenda.

Could I just also go on to say it is really important that Park Royal continues to develop and continues to be renewed and replenished with new and better production facilities? Because that is such a key piece of London and such a big employer. I am very, very clear that that is a priority for me.

John Biggs AM: My other question then, in one minute 46 seconds, is about the £1.5 billion which you repeatedly assert is the sort of ballpark figure you need, and yet there is very little idea of where this money will come from, certainly up front. You alluded to bidding to the Treasury, to Housing Solutions Team (HST), to the Housing Corporation - I thought we were the Housing Corporation in London, by the way - and various other sources. Is it not the case that this is rather premature until you have a better idea of where the money is coming from? Because without external subventions you are going to spend everything on infrastructure and relatively little on the wider regeneration of the area, if you are not careful.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I am very conscious of that concern.

John Biggs AM: You know that that is a very great risk?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I do acknowledge that. What I would say to you is that we started this in several other areas. We will need to build up with a robust evidence base CIL for the area, which will raise significant amounts of money. Then I think we are going to inevitably need to talk to Treasury about some form of TIF, very much along the lines of the Vauxhall Nine Elms one that we start taking the business rate uplift. From the sort of descriptions I have given you about the 55,000 jobs, you can see there is going to be enormous opportunity for business rate increase, which we can extract over a 25-year period, and I think will help us very much get these sums to work.

John Biggs AM: The traditional model in the UK with development corporations is that they do have an underpinning of a considerable Treasury intervention at the very beginning, and they have annual bidding for funding and they agree a programme. I know it is different with a London body, but we no longer have a regional development agency (RDA) to fund us in London. Is there not a fundamental deficiency in the lack of regeneration money on the table to pump prime these sorts of works?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): We are fortunate in London. To be completely fair, we are on the edges of Kensington and Chelsea, we are in an area where land values are moving upwards. We are able to extract quite a lot of value from that, which we can do through the CIL and TIF mechanisms. Unlike other parts of the country, it is probably going to be very difficult for us to make a case when you have much poorer parts of the country trying to make that very case secure making when we have land values which help us. I think we can do it. I think we can extract it. All I would say to you is the Northern line at Vauxhall, which is a £1 billion in cost is all underway at the moment. We have completed the Transport and Works Act, we have a TIF, we have a CIL and we are in the process of borrowing the necessary monies to build it, and we have a funding stream to fund it.

Roger Evans (Chairman): The Labour Group are out of time. Assembly Member Tracey.

Richard Tracey AM: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Edward, can I first of all thank you for organising for the letter to Kit Malthouse [AM] about Wormwood Scrubs, which of course has been circulated to all of us. All of us on this side have received emails from many people who certainly were not constituents of ours but had some concerns, so I think it has helped very much to clarify, and I am grateful to Kit for writing to the Mayor about it.

First of all though, I was going to say there is a lot of experience in this sort of thing, because you will remember, like I do, that it was of course [Lord] Michael Heseltine [MP and Former Secretary of State for the Environment] who set up a similar development corporation to deal with the London docks. It seems to me perhaps there were similar disputes between the various local authorities around the area and look at the great success that there is there now. This is presumably exactly what you are aiming to achieve.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes, in a nutshell. We have modelled this on the LLDC. I think anybody who looks at what has happened there, and I agree it was different and there were different dynamics at play there, but you can see how an MDC, particularly on an area where you have borough boundaries converging, it is on the edges of three boroughs, it does work and work very, very well. It becomes a focal point, it becomes the ambassador, it becomes the ability to raise the money and that becomes very, very powerful. I think we will, by the mid-2020s, be talking about Old Oak in the same way you talk about areas like Canary Wharf. I do think that is the model and that is where we want to go.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): It is worth remembering in all of this that because of the HS2 station at Old Oak, Old Oak will be eight minutes from Euston and just over 30 minutes from Birmingham, about 35 minutes from

Birmingham. All of the HS2 future phases are proposed to come down through Old Oak. The model you described was then, this is something in connectivity terms far greater, the opportunity and the location.

Richard Tracey AM: There you mentioned transport, and I obviously take a great interest in that. Apart from HS2 and the prospects of that, what benefits in local transport will this MDC bring for the local people and the three boroughs around and the rest of the parts of London?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): There are a number of things here. Firstly, as you have seen from the documents, we are talking about 250,000 people per day going through this station, so it is a big transport hub. We are talking about improvements to the Overground line, which we the additional stations that will then in turn lead to additional trains, because they will have the capacity issues, so you have that. There is the need to make sure the whole of Old Oak is properly serviced with - and I am sure the Assembly will insist on this anyway - cycleways and all the other facilities that are needed to make it a very accessible, modern piece of London - and largely a car-free area. That is the way we are moving in London, we are moving away from the car. When you have got something like this it is going to have some of the best transport ratings that it is possible to have, it is a natural place for public transport, and it will be good.

Victoria Hills (Director of the Mayoral Development Corporation): You may already be familiar with how well used the Grand Union Canal is as a cycle path and through the development infrastructure work we are asking them to cost that this should really be "mini-Holland" cycling standard. We should be aiming to put cycling, walking at the heart of the future transport package. There is clearly a lot of work to do in drawing together the transport strategy and the MDC will make that a priority.

Richard Tracey AM: There is only one other question I was going to ask, about the apparent growing dispute between the car retail company in the area and the Queens Park Rangers (QPR) Football Club and their idea of a stadium. Has any discussion been had by the GLA and by the embryonic MDC?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes. We have obviously had endless discussions with all the different land owners, and there are a number. We have had discussions with QPR, we are well aware of QPR's aspirations and we are well aware of where they want to go. I think this is something which will have to work its way through. At the end of the day, it is a commercial matter. They need to clearly identified land which they can acquire and build what they want to build. We are very supportive provided all these commercial considerations can be sorted out.

Richard Tracey AM: Thank you.

Gareth Bacon AM: Just a quick word on representation. A number of Members have picked up the issue of transparency and representation on the board. You have made the, not unreasonable, point that it is a management board, not a local authority committee. Each borough will have one elected member, according to the Mayor's consultation document. Could

you reassure the Assembly that the boroughs concerned - although the Mayor will appoint them officially - will be free to nominate whoever they choose?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Absolutely and I think that is a matter for the boroughs. That is indeed how the Mayor works with the LLDC today. It is left entirely to those boroughs. In fact, in the case of the LLDC they appoint their leaders, but that is a matter for them.

Gareth Bacon AM: The boroughs will have the complete discretion, so they will make that decision themselves?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes.

Gareth Bacon AM: Would you say it is a fair summary that the intention of the MDC is, as far as possible, for the GLA group to work in partnership with the three boroughs for the betterment of those boroughs?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Absolutely. We do not want to fall out with anybody, and it is about working together. I think actually there are shared aspirations. There are some disagreements between the three boroughs and the Mayor at the moment. I do not want to put words in somebody else's mouth, but I think they are relatively minor issues. I think the principles of redeveloping this piece of London and getting a superb piece of new London is something that everybody shares.

Gareth Bacon AM: There will of course be considerable economic and social benefit for the area as a whole, and the three boroughs concerned. That being so, have there been any discussions with the three boroughs regarding the seed funding of the MDC, or will be full cost of that fall on the GLA?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): The full cost falls on the GLA. We have not been looking for any monies out of those boroughs. We are not looking to put any costs on to those boroughs. As far as we are concerned, as the planning authority we need to work out what infrastructure is needed and make sure that infrastructure is built. Of course there is going to be revenue consequences, of new schools and everything else, to those boroughs, Then again there is also going to be the revenue consequences which they will gain of New Homes Bonus, Council Tax, business rates and everything else which will also float them. We think it will all net itself off.

Gareth Bacon AM: Thank you, Sir Edward.

Jenny Jones AM: I have not been convinced by these arguments about keeping Wormwood Scrubs open space inside the MDC. The council that currently has it in their borough is against it. The Friends of the Open Space are against it. It looks like a mayoral land grab. It does not look like a coherent plan.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): If I may, it is a coherent plan, but they do not agree with it.

Jenny Jones AM: Do you not think you should be interested in localism: that decisions for local people for local land should be made by the local borough council and not by the Mayor?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): If I may make the point, to the best of my knowledge, and I will stand to be corrected on this point, but to the best of my knowledge the Trustees of Wormwood Scrubs are all councillors, so they have a very big say in what takes place on Wormwood Scrubs. They have very strong legal powers, which are with them. We are not taking any of that away, all we are doing is putting it within the boundary and, therefore, within the planning boundary of the MDC. We are not taking powers away from them.

Jenny Jones AM: If they are the Trustees, what is the difference between leaving at the land outside the MDC? To me, the arguments you put forward just do not make sense.

Roger Evans (Chairman): Quickly because the Greens are about of time.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I am sorry, all I can do is repeat what I said earlier, if I may, which is that it is about permeability, it is about accessibility, it is about making sure that Wormwood Scrubs is an integral part of this new part of London.

Andrew Boff AM: Sir Edward, survey after survey shows that most of Londoners would prefer to live in street-level homes rather than high-rise developments. With the 350,000 children being brought up in overcrowded conditions it is clear that one of the aims for any MDC should be to alleviate some of those problems and provide more family homes. Can you confirm that the objectives of the proposed MDC will have a commitment to building street-level family homes?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes, not on all of it but on a lot of it.

Andrew Boff AM: OK, thank you.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): As I made clear, I think the area around the stations and towards the centre is going to be very much high rise and commercial, but as you move out towards the edges' it will be more about family housing. It will be a mixture, and certainly we have got some good examples of planning approvals that have been given by the Mayor where we have created street frontages with homes, and in many cases with apartments over the top or other things for different groupings, but we can give you that assurance. It is about the place, it is about families and it is about community. I have no hesitation in making that assurance to you.

Andrew Boff AM: There are many voices now calling out first to concentrate on rediscovering the London vernacular, not the new London vernacular, but the London vernacular housing, which is terraced housing with gardens and front doors that open out onto the street. One of

those voices is Create Streets. Do you think that they can be involved in the development of the plans for Old Oak Common?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Yes, in short. I did a calculation with Victoria [Hills] about if we built everything as terraced houses we would get about 5,000 maximum³, and we are looking for 24,000 homes, so you can see the difference that exists there. That is not to say we should not have family homes, that is not to say we should not have houses. I think it is about a mixed area. I am very happy that as we develop the local plan, as we consult on the OAPF, I am very happy that we have meetings with people like Create Streets and others and make sure we get their input into the proposal.

Andrew Boff AM: I am encouraged by that. I never asked for everything, I just ask for more. Can a commitment on the numbers we could expect for family-sized homes? What would be typical of a development of this nature?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I just do not think we can do it. When we did the crude calculation of 24,000 it was just a massing drawing, nothing more.

Andrew Boff AM: Usually I would stand at my feet at this point if we were talking about the Olympic Park, for instance. The benefits the Olympic Park is of course we did have some idea of the template that we were looking for at the Olympic Park and we could debate about the proportions. Suffice it to say, I am assuming this Assembly will make its opinion felt on the future development of the MDC and so on.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I know that the three boroughs concerned would also be very concerned that there is a high number of family housing down there. I think we are all united in this. As we get the local plan developed we are going to be in a position to give you the sort of reassurances in numbers terms that you are looking for. If I may, the LLDC is a lot further down the road with a lot of this work and we are today.

Andrew Boff AM: Just to go back on a slightly unrelated point, but it did come up in conversation, we have had the boundary of the MDC argued about here and it has been characterised as a mayoral land grab. Could you confirm for me that the future mayors will not be the only people making decisions with regard to the MDC, that it will fully involve the boroughs and representatives from the development community, from the educational community and that there will be democratic decisions focussed on that particular area, and the Mayor will not have a veto?

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): I am afraid the Mayor of the day always does have a veto.

Andrew Boff AM: Sorry, what I meant to say, he is not going to originate all the plans himself?

³ Clarification was provided following the meeting that the maximum number of terraced houses would be approximately 5,500

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): No, he is not. We have tried to learn from the LLDC. We moved the LLDC on. The LLDC board does not have a local resident, it does not have a local business and it does not have those things within it. We have made sure that this MDC board does. We have learned from that and tried to make sure it has more transparency, more accountability to the local community, so we have tried to build that in. As somebody who attends those LLDC meetings, I can tell you that the borough leaders to make sure their views are taken into account and they are very democratic processes that take place, because people do want the same things. It is a delivery function. It is about getting this place built out, not quite as fast as one can, but certainly at a sensible pace.

Andrew Boff AM: Thank you, Sir , thank you, Chair.

Roger Evans (Chairman): Are there any more supplementary questions from the Conservative Group? In that case we have completed the question and answer session. Can I thank our witnesses for the very informative evidence and you may leave us or you may stay, as you wish.

Sir Edward Lister (Mayor's Chief of Staff): Thank you. I will move from here but I will obviously listen to those deliberations.